

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5
6 RICHTEK TECHNOLOGY
7 CORPORATION,

8
9 No. C 09-05659 WHA

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.
12 uPI SEMICONDUCTOR
13 CORPORATION, *et al.*,

14 Defendants. **REQUEST FOR RESPONSE**

15 _____ /
16 A prior order ruled that the current stay shall remain in effect until the remand
17 proceedings in ITC Investigation No. 337-TA-698 are concluded, as uPI asserted a defense
18 therein that it has also asserted in this case. The parties have notified the Court that the ALJ at
19 the ITC has issued a remand recommended determination and that the target date for concluding
20 the ITC investigation is January 8, 2016.

21 The joint status report does not address the status of uPI's consent defense. By
22 **OCTOBER 22 AT NOON**, the parties shall each file a brief **NOT TO EXCEED THREE PAGES** setting
23 forth their positions as to whether that defense remains live. To be clear, this is not an
24 opportunity to seek reconsideration of the prior order maintaining the stay.

25
26 Dated: October 19, 2015.

27
28 
WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE